



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WORLD ORGANIZATION

DISCUSSION ¹

MR. SAMUEL T. DUTTON, Secretary, World Court League: Before the outbreak of the Great War, the United States had shown much interest in a possible federation of the world. Many statesmen, publicists, preachers and writers had proclaimed the importance and the necessity of making an end of war by organizing the nations into some sort of a world state, which should gradually come to possess legislative, executive and judicial functions.

What is known as the peace movement centered in the idea. The Interparliamentary Union composed of delegates from the several legislative bodies of the world seemed to prefigure a more official body which should have power to legislate in the interest of a united world. The ideal of world organization was reflected in all the national peace congresses prior to the war. The Lake Mohonk Conference on Arbitration has justly been given the credit for developing the truth that a large percentage of international differences may be disposed of by methods of mediation, conciliation and arbitration. The several peace societies and foundations, established for the purpose of educating the people to the conception of permanent peace, have recognized that there must be federation of states. Then there has been the important work of the American Peace Society, the Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, and the International Law Association. The published reports and documents of these scholarly and thoroughly representative bodies have discussed repeatedly the requirements for international government, such as a world court, the codification of international law, and the means of making treaties more effective.

Dr. Adler's proposition for a parliament of parliaments has in it much of merit. If he intends to imply that such a parliament is to be made up of members selected from other parliaments, there may be some difficulties in the way. No world parliament would be satisfactory whose personnel was not representative of the highest and most able statesmanship of every nation. There should be no letting down from the standard of the Second Hague Conference.

¹ At the afternoon session, May 29.

If there were time, it might be shown that the influences leading to the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 were generated in the United States, and it is well known that our American delegates to the second conference, especially the late Joseph H. Choate and Dr. James Brown Scott, secured the unanimous approval of the Court of Arbitral Justice. If it had been possible to harmonize the opinions and ambitions represented in the Conference respecting the methods of organizing the court, the history of international relations during the past ten years might have been different from what it has been.

As indicative of the trend of events, let me refer to the record of fifteen cases successfully settled by the Hague Tribunal, and to the thirty treaties negotiated by President Wilson and Secretary Bryan, twenty of which are already in force, providing for the employment of commissions of inquiry and for delay, with agreement not to declare war or begin hostilities while investigation is in progress. These were a few of the events attaching to the peace movement prior to the war. This movement was obnoxious to some, just as every great reform is opposed by people who seem to be decent and not wanting in intelligence. Indeed there are those who seem to be honest in believing that war is such a blessing that it ought not to be interfered with or entirely abolished. Nevertheless it appears from facts that the minds and consciences of leading Americans were committed to judicial methods and to some kind of international co-operation. How about the people? Here, as always, there existed indifference, apathy and ignorance. The everyday life of men and women is too absorbing. They buy and sell; they marry, raise children, struggle to pay their debts and try to amuse themselves. No, the preachers and reformers wanted a better order, but the masses had not been effectively reached.

But the real question is, How will the United States feel and how will she act after the war? Speaking guardedly, believing, as I trust we all do, that we are waging a righteous war and that we must not waver or falter until the end is reached, we may expect an awakening of the popular mind to the need of a new world order. We can hardly hope that the war will be popular. Seriousness of purpose and determination will increase, but anxiety, dread and sorrow will increase still faster. The common man cannot contemplate with composure the increase of his taxes from four to tenfold. Some of course will be made rich; many will be made poor and will suffer. If the war continues for two or three years, the futility and horror of such conflicts will be brought home to the hearthstones of the people

as never before. I predict that as a result, there will be an unprecedented longing that the nations be brought into some kind of a league, that at least a society of nations be formed for the purpose of securing and maintaining peace.

The President has spoken for the nation in favor of the new order, using such broad generic terms as will not embarrass us when the time comes to act. The propaganda of the League to Enforce Peace has aroused much interest. While it has seemed to many that the emphasis was misplaced, Professor Taft and his associates have sounded the call to action in such a manner as to arrest the attention of many representative people. The World Court League believes that judicial settlement sustained by public opinion must be the central aim in any scheme of world organization. Just as the Supreme Court of the United States is the tribunal of last resort for forty-eight empires on this continent, and its decisions have been accepted without the use of force of any kind, so it is thought by many that a court of nations, by the dignity of its position and the majesty of its purpose, will compel respect and obedience. We can now see two leagues enforcing peace with effects which are deadly and damning, viewed in the light of civilization.

After the war, when all Europe is prostrated, when every home is in mourning, when the United States has poured forth her blood and her treasure in the cause of liberty and democracy, may we not expect that there will be a new and stronger demand for world organization to the end that justice, which has been dragged from her high place, may be re-enthroned, and that public opinion, which has been the sheet anchor of civilization at all times, may operate with irresistible power to make and to keep peace?

The international mind which is being developed by the Great War, is susceptible of still further development, first, into international public opinion, growing out of knowledge and experience. The next logical stage of development would be an international will founded upon a universal sense of justice and a determination that unrighteous and cruel wars should forever cease.

MISS LILLIAN D. WALD, Head Worker, Henry Street Settlement, New York: So distinguished a scholar as Professor John Bassett Moore has said that after all we have to deal with human nature, and therefore I am not reluctant to bring a very brief contribution from the experience of those who are just folks. Mr. Moore also gave us a slight suggestion, quoting from a poet, that there was danger of

people being over-proud. There is danger of being over-proud as to what we may do, and how we may appear also. I recall some years ago passing a little modest Chinese laundry. I had been accustomed to nodding good-morning to the two Chinese in that laundry; one day there was only one, and I said to him, "Where is the other one?" He replied, "Him in hospital; Chlistian gentleman hit him on head."

That part of the United States that I know most intimately is, in a small way, practically a world organization, in so far as organization is meant to enable people to get together. I have never found that there was much difficulty in fusing the individuals of peoples of very diverse nationalities when they have been linked by ties that are related to their common life, their jobs, their children, their art, their heroes, their cost of living, or their rent. When thoughtful social workers are engaged in the so-called Americanizing process, they have been most careful to abstain from what might be called "spread-eagleism," or the more shallow expressions of patriotism. On the other hand they have endeavored to show how alike are the ideals of democracy and patriotism the world over. They have indeed tried to make Americanism evident to these people, to show them that Garibaldi, Mazzini, Tolstoy, and Abraham Lincoln were the heroes of all and belong to all; and I might say that that is in contrast to a rather absurd attempt on the part of some people who believe that love for country can be built only upon the argument that this country is better than others.

Good Americans must mean good democrats, if there is any inspiration in the word, and good democrats clasp hands the world over. The people themselves know and understand that America is resourceful and original, but we shall have to relinquish our leadership in democracy to Russia unless our wise men and women devise means and methods for a world organization that rests upon international understanding of the people.

This understanding and organization should not be made obscure by diplomatic technicalities of language. It should be spoken and understood by the simplest in all the land. There are no frontiers between people of honest thought and understanding. There are ties that exist and have existed, that have been expressed not only by the people and the understanding of the people who live together in the great cosmopolitan cities, but by the great scientific international societies, by the international organizations of arts, of medicine and of trade. Moreover, we have got to get into the daily habit

of thinking internationally, in terms of brotherhood. Perhaps if we do that we shall have to sacrifice some of our excessive nationalistic vocabulary; we shall have to educate ourselves up to internationalism; to rewrite our elementary histories; to study the work of the experts who are trying to perfect the machinery for world organization. If we are really in earnest, if we really mean what we say, then it will not be so difficult for the experts to devise the proper machinery.

MR. MOORFIELD STOREY, Boston, Massachusetts: We all sympathize with the ideals which have been suggested to us this afternoon, but this is a practical problem, and I want to call attention to some very practical considerations. Nations in the abstract seem very much alike. What we are dealing with is something like sixty-eight millions of Germans who believe in morality and right, but who believe that their culture is so far superior to the civilization of all other nations that they have a right to impose it by force upon their neighbors. We are dealing with Austrians, and we are dealing with Turks. It is suggested that there should be a congress of nations, that into that congress, if it is to succeed, the nations must all come with the common purpose of finding some way by which they can live together in peace. It will not do to have come into that congress Germany, Austria, Turkey, Bulgaria, not informed with that common purpose, not desiring to find a way to peace, but endeavoring to find some way to construct a new concert of nations which may enable them to force their culture upon their neighbors. Bear that in mind.

Now, we cannot reach the German nation very easily, but we can reach our own. We can perhaps have some influence on the public opinion of this country. It is pleasant to stand here and speak of little Belgium and little Greece and little Serbia and all the other small nations that exist on the other side of the water; it is pleasant for us to preach the doctrine that those small nations are to be treated as our equals, and that we are fighting to give to them in the parliament of nations every right that belongs to Russia or to Germany or to ourselves; but the first step that we must take if we are to influence other nations is to set our own house in order. We must preach by example as well as by precept. It will not do for us to preach about the independence of little Belgium, little Greece or little Serbia, if we are to be met with the question, "What are you doing with the little Philippines and Porto Rico and Haiti and San Domingo and Panama and Colombia?" If in that parliament of nations, we

say to Germany, "Your culture is not so far superior to that of England that you have the right to impose it upon France and Belgium," shall we not be met with the reply, "Well, is your culture so far superior to that of other nations that you have a right to impose it on the Philippines?" I read the other day in the *Saturday Evening Post* an elaborate article pointing out that we must organize China on our side, that we must send our exploiters into China, that we must have all the resources of that country under our control. I did not recognize in that article any suggestion that the Chinese should govern our country, or have any right to labor except in a laundry, that they should have any right, indeed, even to escape the assault of the "Christian gentleman."

But it is not only the people living entirely outside our own nation, it is not only our weak neighbors that we must consider, but it is our own fellow-citizens living here in our states, our colored fellow-citizens—men who, under our Constitution, have every right belonging to the highest in this country, which rights are yet denied to them. We know it. How could we, in this parliament of nations, assert the independence of the poor and the weak—the right of every man to think for himself and of every nation to think for itself, if we cannot in our own states protect men against being lynched, if we have not public opinion in this country to assert the rights of our own colored citizens? This is a practical question that comes home to every American citizen. Before we undertake to lay down the law to Germany, before we undertake to talk about this parliament of the world, which is to observe the rights of the weakest and the poorest nations in Europe, let us clear our own skirts. Let us make up our minds that when that parliament is established we will go into it with clean hands, prepared by our own record and our own example. Only under these conditions can we influence the nations on the other side of the Atlantic.

May I add just one word with reference to education? A statement was made this afternoon that our children are trained so that they are ignorant of international matters. Teachers in colleges and schools should consider the teaching of foreign languages, history, political and social economy, and should teach so as to cultivate the international mind. If the people will support such forward movements, the charge made this afternoon against our educational system will not long be supported by the facts.